<u>REMARKS</u>

<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. In an Office Action dated February 25, 2008, claims 1-39 were rejected and claim 33 was objected to. In the present response, Applicants amend claims 1-5, 9, 15, 22-27, 33, and 34, cancel claims 6-8 and 10-14, and traverse the rejections as follows.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   **Objection of Claim 33**

Claim 33 was objected to because it contains two "at"'s in the claim ("at at least one of the terminal equipment...") Applicants have amended this claim to delete one of these terms.

II.   **Rejection of Claims 1-33 Under 35 U.S.C §112**

Claims 1, 15, 22, 28, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the phrase "ones of the at least one packet" is allegedly unclear as to how many packets are required. Applicants have amended these claims to better clarify the claimed subject matter.

III.   **Rejection of Claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Parantainen et al. (US 7,054,268).

Regarding claim 1, it was alleged that Paratainen et al. teaches all of the elements of Applicants' claimed subject matter. Specifically, it was alleged that Paratainen et al. teaches a memory for storing a list, the list comprising a Van Jacobson (VJ) connection identification in column 20, lines 12-21 and in column 22, line 51. It was also alleged that Paratainen et al. teaches delineating a received connection identification of a VJ compressed packet against the list in column 18, lines 55-58 and in column 22, lines 26-54. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Paratainen et al. is directed to "a method...by which an application executing in an application layer of a multi-layer communication protocol forming part of a general packet radio service (GPRS) session can signal for the setup and release of Temporary Block Flow (TBF)

which will not be released during application execution in silent (inactive) periods. When applications such as voice, telnet or web browsing have specific traffic type data that have inactive periods between active periods are to be carried over GPRS, the session consists of multiple active periods. Current TBF release procedures lead to multiple TBF setups during such sessions. With the method described, a special type of TBF can be set up with special procedures for release of this TBF which greatly minimizes the need for multiple TBF setups during a session containing data transfers with inactive periods between active data transmissions". (*Paratainen et al., abstract*)

Further details of this method describe "control of Temporary Block Flow (TBF) at the application level of a multi-level communication over GPRS. It is particularly directed to applications which have the need for inhibiting the release of TBF during passive or silent periods which may exist during the execution of the application. Such applications include voice applications, telnet interaction with remote computers over the Internet as well as web browsing over the Internet." (Paratainen et al., column 19, lines 12-15) An application participates in the setup and release of TBF such that TBF may be defined and signaled from an upper layer protocol application to the RLC/MAC layer to avoid a TBF release during the occurrence of a silent or passive period. (Paratainen et al., column 19, lines 21-27) In particular, different types of call control signaling can be used to set up radio bearers and an end-to-end connection between two users. For example, in voice communication over GSM/EDGE RAN (EGRS) H.323 or SIP, signaling can be used. (Paratainen et al., column 19, lines 33-38)

In short, Paratainen et al. teaches a method, used in the GPRS protocol, for controlling a TBF that would normally terminate a communication during periods of silence and/or passive periods. Importantly, Applicants note that Paratainen et al. is ***completely silent*** regarding Van Jacobson header compression.

With regard to claim 1, it was alleged that Paratainen et al. discloses a memory for storing a list, the list comprising a Van Jacobson (VJ) connection identification, in column 20, lines 12-21 and in column 22, line 51. However, these sections from Paratainen et al. teach nothing of the sort. The term "Van Jacobson" cannot be found in the cited sections, or anywhere else in Paratainen at al. Therefore, Paratainen et al. cannot possibly teach a memory for storing a list of Van Jacobson connection identifications. Based on this alone, the rejection should be

withdrawn.

It was also alleged that Paratainen et al. teaches delineating a received connection identification of a VJ compressed packet against the list in column 18, lines 55-58 and in column 22, lines 26-54). Again, no mention of Van Jacobson compression can be found anywhere within Paratainen et al. Therefore, this reference cannot teach a delineation (now amended to read --comparison--) of connection identification contained in received VJ compressed packets to VJ connection identification stored in a list. Again, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn, because Paratainen et al. fails to teach each and every element of Applicants' claimed subject matter.

With regard to claims 2-5 and 9, Applicants note that these claims depend on claim 1, which Applicants believe to be an allowable claim. Therefore, Applicants believe that these claims are likewise allowable as depending on an allowable claim. In addition, Applicants note that these claims further recite manipulating data packets based on information contained in VJ compressed and/or uncompressed data packets. Applicants do not believe that Paratainen et al. discloses any information regarding Van Jacobson header compression or manipulation of data packets based on information contained within the VJ header. On this basis, Applicants also respectively request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 15, it was alleged that Paratainen et al. teaches a receiver for receiving IP data packets and VJ compressed data packets in step 1010 of Figure 15. Step 1010 of Figure 15 shows the step of "Snooper observes data packets to determine if a special format data packet indicative of release of TBF (e.g. TCP/IP FIN commend received)". This in no way teaches or discloses reception of a VJ compressed data packet. Paratainen et al. is concerned about detecting the presence of a special data packet that indicates a release of TBF, not about receiving or manipulating Van Jacobson compressed data packets. On this basis alone, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

However, the rejection to claim 15 is further traversed by noting that Paratainen et al. fails to teach forwarding of connection identification to a list for subsequently assign a destination of a VJ compressed data packet. It was alleged that Paratainen et al. teaches this in

column 22, line 51 ("Protocol/Application"). Column 22, line 51 is reprinted as follows:

"Thus the snooper element observes data packets being sent and received and is able to interpret the contents of the data packets being transferred; that is, it knows the protocol/application being used"

This sentence is simply a broad statement indicating that a "snooper" can determine the protocol of data packets and their associated applications as the data packets are sent and received. A rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) requires that each and every element of the claim must be disclosed. There is no disclosure of Van Jacobson data packets; no disclosure of assessing connection identification in a Van Jacobson compressed data packet; and no disclosure of forwarding connection information found in a VJ compressed data packet to a list. Based on all of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to claims 16-21, Applicants note that these claims depend on claim 15, which Applicants believe to be an allowable claim. Therefore, Applicants believe that these claims are likewise allowable as depending on an allowable claim. In addition, Applicants note that these claims further recite manipulating data packets based on information contained in VJ compressed or uncompressed data packets. Applicants do not believe that Paratainen et al. discloses any information regarding Van Jacobson header compression or manipulation of data packets based on information contained within the VJ header. Therefore, Applicants respectively request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) to these claims be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 22, it was alleged that Paratainen et al. teaches "comparing a connection identification of the VJ compressed data packet with the VJ connection identification in the list and forwarding the VJ compressed data packet, without decompressing the VJ compressed data packet, to an intended destination depending on the comparison". As noted in the remarks against the rejection to claim 1, Paratainen et al. fails to teach Van Jacobson compressed data packets or comparing connection identification contained within a VJ compressed data packet to connection identification stored in a memory. Those remarks are hereby incorporated herein with respect to the rejection of claim 22. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to this claim be withdrawn.

With regard to claims 23-27, Applicants note that these claims depend on claim 22, which Applicants believe to be an allowable claim. Therefore, Applicants believe that these claims are likewise allowable as depending on an allowable claim. In addition, Applicants note that these claims further recite manipulating data packets based on information contained in VJ compressed or uncompressed data packets. Applicants do not believe that Paratainen et al. discloses any information regarding Van Jacobson header compression or manipulation of data packets based on information contained within the VJ header. Therefore, Applicants respectively request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) to these claims be withdrawn.

With regard to the remaining claims, Applicants note that, in general, each of them involve the use Van Jacobson compression, determining connection identification associated with a VJ compressed and/or uncompressed data packet, comparing that connection identification to a list of connection identifiers stored in a list, and performing an action based on the comparison. The rejections of the remaining claims simply repeat the reasons for rejection in the above-discussed claims. Therefore, Applicants incorporate herein all of the previous remarks relating to the rejections made with respect to claims 1-27, and respectfully request that the rejections to the remaining claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 25, 2008   By: /Kristine U. Ekwueme/
                                       Kristine U. Ekwueme, Reg. No. 56,344
                                       (858) 658-1901

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5102
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502